

CHAPTER 2: RESULTS FROM THE 2002–03 ADMINISTRATIONS

Introduction

The legislation establishing the CAHSEE called for the first operational forms of the exam to be administered in Spring 2001 to 9th graders in the Class of 2004. At the first administration 9th graders could volunteer, but were not required, to take both portions of the exam. Students who did not pass the exam in that administration were required to take the exam as 10th graders in Spring 2002. Preliminary results from the CAHSEE administrations in Spring 2001 and 2002 were reported in the Year 2 and Year 3 evaluation reports (Wise et al., June 2001; Wise et al., June 2002b). Results from the 2001 administration were reported more fully in the first of the biennial evaluation reports to the Legislature, Governor, Board, and CDE (Wise et al., Jan. 2002a). More complete results are available on the CDE website at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/hs/>

The 2002–03 administrations analyzed for this report included two new features. First, the test was administered year-round, six times from July 2002 through May 2003, rather than just in the spring. For the most part, we have combined results across all six administrations. Students, particularly students in the Class of 2004, took the exam multiple times. They are thus included more than once in counts of the total number of tests administered.

A second key difference from prior years was that the 2003 test administrations included students from two different high school classes. Students in the Class of 2004 who had not yet passed both parts of the exam continued to retake the exam. The intention was that these students would have up to three chances to take the parts of the exam they had not yet passed, although it appears that a few students may have attempted the exam more than three times. All students in the Class of 2005 were supposed to take the exam in either the March or May 2003 administration. Insofar as possible, we show results separately for each high school class.

Who Tested?

Tables 2.1 and 2.2 show the number of students participating in each of the six CAHSEE administrations during the 2002–03 school year. Counts are shown separately by subject, since many students had passed one of the two parts of the exam and only took the part they had not yet passed. Counts also are shown separately by the grade level reported for each student. Tables 2.1 and 2.2 also show the percent of students who passed each part of the exam and the number who took the test with modifications. Taking the test with modifications invalidates the students' scores, but students receiving these modifications and scoring at a level that would otherwise have been passing (350 or more), may submit a request for a waiver of the requirement to successfully pass the exam. As shown in Tables 2.1 and 2.2, the majority of students taking the test with modifications would not have passed.

TABLE 2.1 Number of Students Taking the CAHSEE ELA Exam in 2002–03 by Grade and Administration

Grade	Administration	No. Tested*	Pct. Pass	No. Tested with Modification	Pct. > 349 W/Modif.
10	July 2002	0		0	
10	Sep. 2002	775	68.5	6	16.7
10	Nov. 2002	1,505	44.7	6	0.0
10	Jan. 2003	289	44.8	0	
10	March 2003	380,038	78.8	1,365	25.9
10	May 2003	22,142	68.9	42	33.3
10	Total**	404,748	78.1	1,419	26.0
11	July 2002	15,145	29.5	117	8.5
11	Sep. 2002	19,635	34.4	195	18.5
11	Nov. 2002	62,139	40.7	633	20.5
11	Jan. 2003	15,310	30.9	216	13.9
11	March 2003	47,721	33.1	933	19.8
11	May 2003	10,497	30.1	234	18.8
11	Total**	170,447	35.3	2,328	18.7
Other	July 2002	127	41.7	0	
Other	Sep. 2002	262	45.0	7	14.3
Other	Nov. 2002	923	51.2	0	0.0
Other	Jan. 2003	477	47.2	1	0.0
Other	March 2003	1,813	55.0	0	0.0
Other	May 2003	149	62.4	0	0.0
Other	Total**	3,751	52.3	8	12.5

* Includes students tested with modification.

** Totals are counts of total tests administered; students who tested more than once are included multiple times in these totals.

Approximately 16,000 10th graders tested from July 2002 through January 2003 administrations; this number was surprising. Even though tenth graders should not have tested until March or May 2003, these students appear to be a mixture of two different groups. First, many students originally in the Class of 2004 may not have completed sufficient course work to be considered 11th graders during the 2002–03 school year. This was particularly true for the July 2002 administration, where some students may have been taking makeup courses during the summer. In addition, students in the July 2002 administration may have coded themselves as 10th graders since they had not yet started the 2002–03 school year. Second, it appears that some students in the Class of 2005 did get an early start, taking the CAHSEE early in their 10th grade school year.

In the analyses that follow, we treated all 10th graders in the July 2002 administration and those 10th graders in subsequent administrations who had earlier CAHSEE test results, prior to July 2002, as members of the Class of 2004. All other 10th graders in the administrations from September 2002 through May 2003 were treated as members of the Class of 2005. The counts are thus approximate for two reasons: 1) Some students who started high school with the Class of 2004 may now not expect to graduate until June 2005, so their status is truly

ambiguous; 2) Some 10th grade students who appeared to be first-time test-takers had actually tested previously, at a different school or with a different coding of name or birth date. *Since California does not have statewide student identifiers, it is not possible to track student results across different administrations with complete precision.*

TABLE 2.2 Number of Students Taking the CAHSEE Mathematics Exam in 2002–03 by Grade and Administration

Grade	Admin	No. Tested*	Pct. Pass	No. Tested with Modification	Pct. > 349 W/Modif.
10	July 2002	0		0	
10	Sep. 2002	892	48.3	12	0.0
10	Nov. 2002	2,222	21.7	69	8.7
10	Jan. 2003	363	21.8	7	14.3
10	March 2003	390,875	59.8	5,021	13.0
10	May 2003	23,384	43.5	281	2.5
10	Total**	417,736	58.6	5,390	12.4
11	July 2002	30,774	23.7	461	11.5
11	Sep. 2002	35,726	20.5	616	6.7
11	Nov. 2002	111,570	23.3	3,119	9.9
11	Jan. 2003	28,053	18.7	814	11.4
11	March 2003	92,060	20.8	4,183	10.3
11	May 2003	20,587	18.9	764	12.6
11	Total**	318,770	21.6	9,957	10.3
Other	July 2002	218	21.1	0	
Other	Sep. 2002	378	17.2	6	0.0
Other	Nov. 2002	1,177	19.6	16	6.3
Other	Jan. 2003	589	19.9	5	20.0
Other	March 2003	1,968	23.1	3	0.0
Other	May 2003	169	24.9	0	
Other	Total**	4,499	21.2	30	6.7

* Includes students tested with modification.

** Totals are counts of total tests administered; students who tested more than once are included multiple times in these totals.

Scoring Consistency

In past reports, we have examined the accuracy of the scores generated from different parallel forms of the exam. During the Year 4 evaluation, we monitored ETS's analysis of item-level statistics from each administration and found no significant changes from the results for prior forms. More complete information on test accuracy may be found in technical documentation provided by ETS.

We paid particular attention to consistency in the scoring of student essays. Each student taking the ELA exam was required to write two essays, the first involving analysis of an associated text and the second in response to a freestanding question that did not involve text processing. Each essay was graded by at least two different scorers following a four-point

rubric that indicated the response characteristics required for each score level. A score of zero was assigned to responses that were off-topic, illegible, or left blank.

A new ELA test form with new essay questions was used for each of the CAHSEE administrations. Since the scoring rubrics vary from question to question, we monitored the level of agreement between independent scorers for each question used with each administration. Table 2.3 shows how often (what percent of the time) there was exact agreement, how often there was a difference of just one score point, and how often there was a difference of more than one score point. Whenever there was an initial difference of more than one score point, the essay was read again by a third, more experienced reader and the scores assigned by one or both of the initial readers were not used. Thus, all operational scores resulted from two scorers who agreed to within a single score point.

TABLE 2.3 Scoring Consistency for Student Essays

Administration	Percent of Essays at Each Level of Agreement					
	1st Essay			2 nd Essay		
	Exact	+/- 1	+/- > 1	Exact	+/- 1	+/- > 1
July 2002	65.2	33.0	1.8	66.2	32.2	1.6
Sep. 2002	68.2	30.7	1.0	69.0	30.0	0.9
Nov. 2002	71.3	27.9	0.8	68.4	30.8	0.8
Jan. 2003	70.6	28.2	1.1	70.3	28.9	0.8
March 2003	64.5	33.6	1.9	62.2	36.2	1.6
May 2003	70.1	29.2	0.7	69.4	29.9	0.7
Average	65.8	32.5	1.7	63.9	34.7	1.4

Results indicated a generally high level of agreement between the independent scorers. In each administration, on less than two percent of the essays read there was a significant disagreement (initial scores differing by more than one point). There was minor variation in scoring consistency across the different administrations, with slightly lower consistency for both essays in the July 2002 and March 2003 administrations. For these two administrations, there was significant disagreement on more than 1.5 percent of the essays. The disagreement level for the other administrations was about one percent or less. Differences across administrations could reflect normal variation across different essay questions. The fact that consistency was lower for both essays in these administrations suggests the possibility of somewhat more systematic variation. The demand for rapid turnaround on a very large number of essays in the March 2003 administration may have been a factor. Other factors, such as summer vacations or demand from other testing programs, may have affected results from the July 2002 administration, which did not involve such a large number of students.

Tables 2.4 and 2.5 provide more detailed information on scores assigned by each of the two independent scorers across all administrations. There was near perfect agreement on the essays judged to be unscorable (score level 0). There was generally good agreement on essays assigned to score levels 1 through 3. If the first reader assigned a score at one of these levels, the second reader was most likely to assign the same score. Very few essays were assigned a score of 4 and agreement at this level was correspondingly less. If the first reader assigned a score of 4, the second reader was most likely to assign a score of 3.

One other finding is that scores on the first essay were consistently lower, by a small amount, than scores on the second essay, which did not require reading text beyond the question itself. Since scores on both essay questions are combined with scores from the reading portion of the ELA exam, the extra reading load of the first essay does not create an issue.

TABLE 2.4 Percent of Essays Assigned Each Score Level by Each Scorer—First Essay

First Scorer	Second Scorer				
	0	1	2	3	4
0	5.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1	0.00	23.82	7.64	0.40	0.02
2	0.00	7.61	25.47	6.94	0.41
3	0.00	0.41	6.84	9.73	1.72
4	0.00	0.02	0.41	1.72	1.17
Average Score from First Scorer					1.82
Average Score from Second Scorer					1.82

TABLE 2.5 Percent of Essays Assigned Each Score Level by Each Scorer—Second Essay

First Scorer	Second Scorer				
	0	1	2	3	4
0	3.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1	0.00	11.66	5.73	0.26	0.01
2	0.00	5.57	30.22	8.87	0.44
3	0.00	0.24	8.75	16.36	2.92
4	0.00	0.01	0.43	2.91	2.20
Average Score from First Scorer					2.15
Average Score from Second Scorer					2.15

Who Passed?

A major charge for the independent evaluation was to analyze and report performance on the CAHSEE for all students and for specific demographic groups, including economically disadvantaged students, English learners (EL), and students with disabilities (characterized as “exceptional needs students” in the legislation). Tables 2.6 and 2.7 show, for each portion of the CAHSEE, the passing rates for each of these demographic groups as well as for gender and ethnicity. The passing rates shown in these tables were calculated by dividing the total number of students who passed each subject by the total enrollment at the beginning of the 10th grade. (For economically disadvantaged students, separate fall enrollment statistics were not available. We substituted reported enrollment at the time of the 10th grade STAR assessment. Overall, these numbers are slightly lower than initial 10th grade enrollments, but the difference is small.)

TABLE 2.6 Passing Rates by Demographic Group—English-Language Arts

Group	Class	10 th Grade Enrollment*	Cumulative Percent Passing by end of:		
			9 th Grade	10 th Grade	11 th Grade
All Students	2004	459,580	51.4	72.6	85.8
	2005	471,648	—	66.9	
Female	2004	223,055	57.5	78.0	90.2
	2005	228,997	—	71.4	
Male	2004	236,533	45.7	67.2	81.3
	2005	242,651	—	62.6	
Asian	2004	39,021	61.1	81.5	92.0
	2005	40,606	—	81.6	
Black	2004	38,240	38.8	59.9	77.1
	2005	39,896	—	54.9	
Hispanic	2004	184,124	39.1	58.8	74.6
	2005	193,227	—	54.0	
White	2004	175,797	63.1	84.8	93.9
	2005	173,996	—	79.2	
Economically Disadvantaged	2004	125,139	43.0	66.5	84.2
	2005	140,933	—	59.9	
English Learner	2004	77,446	18.8	36.1	55.5
	2005	80,592	—	35.6	
Special Education	2004	47,169	17.3	31.2	44.5
	2005	48,818	—	26.1	

Enrollment counts are from CDE's DataQuest System, except for economically disadvantaged students.

DataQuest does not include counts for these students by grade. Counts of economically disadvantaged students included in the 2002 and 2003 STAR results are used as estimates of 10th grade enrollment for economically disadvantaged (ED) students. In Tables 2.6 and 2.7 students were sorted into high school classes on the basis of prior test information as well as the indicated grade. Counts will differ slightly from counts above based on grade alone.

The first major result indicated in Tables 2.6 and 2.7 is that the cumulative passing rates for the Class of 2005 were similar to, but slightly lower than, cumulative passing rates for the Class of 2004 at the end of the 10th grade. This finding is at odds with the finding reported in our May 2003 report on standards-based instruction (Wise et al., May 2003). In that report, it was suggested that passing rates should increase for classes after 2004 because the extent and effectiveness of standards-based instruction was improving. Note, however, that the comparison is not entirely fair in that significant numbers of students in the Class of 2004 had two (or in a few cases more) chances to pass each subject, while most members of the Class of 2005 had only one chance. Passing rates for the Class of 2005 were higher than initial passing rates for the Class of 2004 from the 2001 CAHSEE administration. This comparison is also not fair, however, because students from the Class of 2004 were only in the 9th grade in 2001 and because only “volunteers” participated in the 2001 administration. Thus, there is no very accurate basis for comparing results from the Classes of 2004 and 2005 at this time.

The second major result shown in Tables 2.6 and 2.7 is that passing rates continued to vary significantly by demographic group. *English learners and students with disabilities (special education students) continued to have very low passing rates, particularly in mathematics.* As before, passing rates for females were higher in ELA and about the same in mathematics as passing rates for males. Passing rates for Blacks and Hispanics were significantly lower than passing rates for Whites and Asians.

TABLE 2.7 Passing Rates by Demographic Group—Mathematics

Group	Class	10 th Grade Enrollment*	Cumulative Percent Passing by end of:		
			9 th Grade	10 th Grade	11 th Grade
All Students	2004	459,580	35.2	52.6	67.7
	2005	471,648	–	51.9	
Female	2004	223,055	34.4	51.7	67.6
	2005	228,997	–	52.3	
Male	2004	236,533	35.9	53.4	67.5
	2005	242,651	–	51.3	
Asian	2004	39,021	56.6	77.7	90.4
	2005	40,606	–	78.2	
Black	2004	38,240	18.7	31.1	46.1
	2005	39,896	–	30.5	
Hispanic	2004	184,124	20.3	34.1	51.3
	2005	193,227	–	35.3	
White	2004	175,797	48.4	68.9	81.1
	2005	173,996	–	67.5	
Economically Disadvantaged	2004	125,139	24.0	40.8	59.5
	2005	140,933	–	41.2	
English Learner	2004	77,446	10.7	23.3	41.3
	2005	80,592	–	25.8	
Special Education	2004	47,169	9.5	16.0	24.0
	2005	48,818	–	13.7	

Enrollment counts are from CDE's DataQuest System, except for economically disadvantaged students. DataQuest does not include counts for these students by grade. Counts of economically disadvantaged students included in the 2002 and 2003 STAR results are used as estimates of 10th grade enrollment for economically disadvantaged (ED) students. In Tables 2.6 and 2.7 students were sorted into high school classes on the basis of prior test information as well as the indicated grade. Counts will differ slightly from counts above based on grade alone.

Cumulative passing rates for the Class of 2004 continued to increase at nearly the same annual rate as in 2002. Cumulative passing rates increased 13 percent for ELA and 15 percent for mathematics from the end of 10th grade to the end of 11th grade, compared to increases of 21 percent and 17 percent respectively from the end of 9th grade to the end of 10th grade. If the CAHSEE requirement for the Class of 2004 had been continued and there were similar increases in cumulative passing rates during the 12th grade, the overall passing rates at the time of graduation would have been about 95 percent for ELA and 80 percent for mathematics. Note that these passing rates are based on all students enrolled in the 10th grade in Fall 2001. Some of these students have failed to advance to the 11th grade (as indicated in

Table 2.14 below). Thus some students originally in the Class of 2004 who would have failed to pass the CAHSEE by the end of 12th grade would have been denied a diploma anyway for failing to complete required coursework or meet other requirements for graduation. The lack of a system of statewide student records, however, makes it impossible to determine how many students would have been denied a diploma due to the CAHSEE requirements alone.

The results by race and ethnicity were confounded to some extent due to interactions of race and ethnicity with other demographic characteristics. In particular, a higher proportion of Hispanic students were English learners and a higher proportion of Black and Hispanic students were economically disadvantaged compared to White students and a higher proportion of Hispanic students were English learners. We further analyzed test results for the census testing of the Class of 2005 to show separate race/ethnicity results within different levels of disadvantaged characteristics as shown in Table 2.8. These levels were defined to be non-overlapping as: (a) Special education students, (b) English learners who were not special education students, (c) Economically disadvantaged students who were neither English learners nor special education students, and 4) Students who were not in any of the preceding categories. Note that in this table, passing rates were based just on those tested since we did not have separate enrollment data for the categories analyzed. Passing rates here were thus slightly higher than rates based on total enrollment.

TABLE 2.8 Passing Rates for Class of 2005 Students by Student Category and Race

Student Category	Race / Ethnicity	ELA		Mathematics	
		Number	Percent Passing	Number	Percent Passing
Special Education (SE) Students	Asian	1,079	42.9	1,004	37.0
	Black	3,991	23.8	3,824	7.0
	Hispanic	12,734	23.8	11,930	10.1
	White	13,246	58.2	12,401	36.6
English Learners (EL) not in Special Education	Asian	8,934	57.8	8,995	64.9
	Black	500	41.8	515	20.8
	Hispanic	47,494	42.4	49,396	25.3
	White	2,270	60.1	2,332	53.3
Economically Disadvantaged, but not EL or SE	Asian	7,145	92.1	7,263	83.4
	Black	10,451	67.9	11,015	32.0
	Hispanic	46,296	80.2	48,420	50.1
	White	15,184	86.0	15,810	63.2
All Other Students	Asian	20,932	97.2	21,066	92.7
	Black	16,882	81.0	17,596	47.1
	Hispanic	51,841	85.2	53,837	56.6
	White	120,893	95.8	122,972	82.7

Gaps in passing rates by race and ethnicity were smaller for students who were not disadvantaged than they were when all students in each race/ethnicity category were included. More striking, however, was the extent of racial/ethnic differences among special education students. Passing rates for the ELA test were twice as high for White and Asian students in this category as they were for Black or Hispanic students. ***For math, the passing rate for special education students who were White or Asian was more than five times as high as the passing rate for special education students who were Black.***

There may be many reasons for differences in passing rates by race/ethnicity among special education students, such as differences in the nature or severity of disabilities. Further investigation of the differences will be conducted in the final year of the evaluation.

We analyzed the passing rates on the ELA exam by English language fluency designation as shown in Table 2.9. For each class, passing rates for the first three categories, each indicating fluency, were very similar. Students who were bilingual and either initially fluent or redesignated as fluent after English language instruction passed at slightly higher rates than students who were fluent in English only. Passing rates for students identified as English learners were about half the rates for students in the other categories. ***These results suggest that if English learners achieve fluency, the ELA portion of the CAHSEE should not pose a significant barrier.***

Within each fluency category, passing rates for the Class of 2004 were about half the rates shown for the Class of 2005. This is not surprising since students in the Class of 2004 who were still taking the ELA exam had failed, often two or more times. These students clearly had low ELA skills to begin with. Most of the students in the Class of 2005 were taking the exam for the first time. Many of these students had much higher levels of ELA skills than the repeat takers from the class of 2004, and they passed on their first attempt.

TABLE 2.9 2002–03 ELA Passing Rates by English Language Fluency

English Language Fluency	Class of 2004		Class of 2005	
	Number of Tests Administered	Percent Passing	Number of Tests Administered	Percent Passing
English Only	80,733	44.0%	255,379	85.0%
Initially Fluent	9,734	45.4%	36,381	87.1%
Redesignated Fluent	10,305	46.8%	42,794	87.7%
English Learner	67,459	22.1%	68,075	42.4%
Missing/Unknown	2,210	41.9%	2,115	61.5%
All Students	170,447	35.6%	404,748	78.2%

We also analyzed passing rates on the mathematics part of the CAHSEE for students who had completed different levels of math courses. Table 2.10 shows passing rates for first-time and repeat test-takers by the highest-level mathematics course they had completed or were currently enrolled in.

TABLE 2.10 2002–03 Mathematics Passing Rates by Highest Math Course Taken

Highest Math Course Taken	Class of 2004		Class of 2005	
	Number of Tests Administered	Percent Passing	Number of Tests Administered	Percent Passing
General Math	20,837	14.7%	12,422	18.4%
Pre-Algebra	62,780	19.1%	47,976	34.7%
Algebra I	74,503	23.3%	112,162	38.5%
Integrated Math I	2,068	24.3%	2,770	55.2%
Integrated Math II	3,016	36.4%	4,857	75.5%
Geometry	40,560	38.0%	124,344	76.1%
Algebra II	8,197	39.0%	72,694	91.0%
Advanced Math	173	45.1%	7,779	98.2%
Unknown	106,636	16.1%	32,732	30.0%
All Students	318,770	21.9%	417,736	58.8%
Total Tests	309,415		425,724	

As in the 2001 and 2002 administrations, passing rates for the 2002–03 administrations were considerably higher for students who completed higher levels of math coursework. For the Class of 2005, passing rates for students who were taking or had taken Geometry, Algebra II, Advanced Math, or the second year of an Integrated Math series were quite high, 75 percent or better, compared to less than 40 percent for students taking algebra or pre-algebra and less than 20 percent for students who had taken only general math.

Passing rates were considerably lower for students in the Class of 2004, all of whom had failed to pass the mathematics portion of the CAHSEE one or more times prior to the 2002–03 school year. Passing rates were significantly higher for students who were taking mathematics beyond Algebra I or Integrated Mathematics I. The low passing rates at each course level suggest that these students may not have had the prerequisite skills to benefit fully from the mathematics courses they were taking.

One other significant difference between the near census assessment of the Class of 2005 and the limited sample of repeat test-takers in the Class of 2004 was that, even though they were in 10th rather than 11th grade, a much higher proportion of students in the Class of 2005 had taken mathematics courses beyond algebra. Nearly half of the students in the Class of 2005 were enrolled in geometry or higher-level courses, compared to only 15 percent of the students tested from the Class of 2004.

Testing Accommodations and Modifications

Students with disabilities who could not be assessed using normal test administration procedures were allowed specific accommodations or, in some cases, modifications to test administration procedures. The difference is that modifications involved changes that would alter the construct measured and so scores from modified administrations were not valid for passing the CAHSEE. (See CAHSEE regulations posted on CDE's website.) Tables 2.11 and

2.12 show the number of students tested with each alternative type of test accommodations and also with specific test-administration modifications.

For students in each class, the most frequent accommodation was additional time, followed by additional breaks and having directions read to them. Special education students receiving accommodations for physical limitations, including Braille or large print versions and an answer scribe, had passing rates that were considerably higher than students receiving other, more general accommodations. Special education students in the Class of 2005 receiving these specific accommodations passed at rates above 60 percent, compared to passing rates below 30 percent for students receiving the most common accommodations. Students who took the CAHSEE with modifications had relatively low scores and most did not achieve a score of 350 or higher.

TABLE 2.11 Frequency and Passing Rates for Test Accommodations and Modifications—Class of 2004

Accommodation	Class of 2004											
	Special Ed. (SE) Students				English Learners (EL)*				Neither SE nor EL			
	ELA		MATH		ELA		MATH		ELA		Math	
	Freq	% Pass	Freq	% Pass	Freq	% Pass	Freq	% Pass	Freq	% Pass	Freq	% Pass
<i>Presentation</i>												
Braille	20	20.0	31	16.1	2	0.0	0		4	25.0	6	16.7
Large Print	74	17.6	97	11.3	3	100.0	2	50.0	7	42.9	13	23.1
Direction												
Reading	3,306	14.6	3,233	6.5	103	4.9	103	3.9	238	22.7	254	8.3
Audio												
Presentation			1,283	5.5			13	0.0			76	11.8
Other	356	14.0	378	12.4	42	2.4	43	0.0	52	15.4	64	4.7
<i>Response</i>												
Marked												
Answers	340	17.4	380	9.7	12	25.0	11	0.0	40	22.5	45	11.1
Scribe An-												
swer Doc.	177	23.7	148	16.2	3	33.3	0		15	33.3	19	21.1
Other	143	28.0	69	10.1	24	4.2	28	0.0	28	14.3	30	10.0
<i>Scheduling</i>												
Additional												
Time	5,468	17.2	6,130	8.2	172	6.4	164	6.7	458	23.4	495	11.3
Additional												
Breaks	3,581	17.2	4,161	8.0	77	7.8	73	1.4	262	15.7	337	10.4
Other	824	19.5	1,077	8.4	34	8.8	41	7.3	63	20.6	79	8.9
<i>Modification</i>												
Audio												
Presentation	1,688	18.0			20	15.0			92	15.2		
Calculator			8,921	10.2			208	6.7			623	12.5
Other	519	23.1	301	14.3	37	2.7	42	0.0	44	20.5	57	21.1

* Students coded as both special education and English learners are included under the special education column only.

TABLE 2.12 Frequency and Passing Rates for Test Accommodations and Modifications—
Class of 2005

Accommodation/Modification	Class of 2005											
	Special Ed. Students (SE)				English Learners (EL)*				Neither SE nor EL			
	ELA		MATH		ELA		MATH		ELA		Math	
	Freq	% Pass	Freq	% Pass	Freq	% Pass	Freq	% Pass	Freq	% Pass	Freq	% Pass
<i>Presentation</i>												
Braille	25	76.0	23	34.8	2	0.0	3	0.0	6	50.0	6	66.7
Large Print	79	62.0	70	37.1	4	75.0	5	0.0	12	83.3	12	50.0
Direction												
Reading	2480	19.0	2145	6.6	82	8.5	74	1.4	158	35.4	129	17.1
Audio												
Presentation			648	5.1			5	0.0			20	10.0
Other	233	27.5	189	17.5	15	6.7	15	6.7	12	41.7	20	20.0
<i>Response</i>												
Marked												
Answers	285	29.5	229	12.7	12	33.3	11	18.2	51	62.8	51	43.1
Scribe												
Answer												
Doc.	162	60.5	98	36.7	3	66.7	4	25.0	20	60.0	19	52.6
Other	120	57.5	21	14.3	1	0.0	0		8	50.0	4	50.0
<i>Scheduling</i>												
Additional												
Time	4222	27.6	3631	10.7	165	12.1	144	1.4	392	36.7	369	17.1
Additional												
Breaks	2649	24.3	2274	8.5	92	8.7	79	3.8	244	29.1	238	12.2
Other	654	32.0	612	14.4	4	0.0	3	0.0	32	43.8	27	18.5
<i>Modification</i>												
Audio												
Presentation	969	24.9			20	10.0			45	28.9		
Calculator			4806	12.1			129	5.4			429	16.3
Other	406	30.1	99	9.1	22	9.1	12	0.0	27	63.0	15	26.7

* Students coded as both special education and English learners are included under the special education column only.

Passing rates for English learners receiving specific accommodations (excluding those who were also special education students) were generally lower than passing rates for student with disabilities who received the same accommodation. This result suggests that accommodations do not eliminate the need to learn to read in English in order to pass each part of the CAHSEE.

One other finding shown in Tables 2.11 and 2.12 is that accommodations were allowed for a small number of students who were neither special education students nor English learners. It may well be that information about disabilities or language fluency or about the provision of testing accommodations was incorrect for these students. Otherwise, the decision rules used by schools in allowing accommodations were not clearly documented.

Since passing rates for these students were still relatively low, there is no evidence that allowing accommodations to students who may not have needed them provided any unfair advantage.

Relationship of CAHSEE Results to Other Test Results

A key question addressed in the independent evaluation of the CAHSEE is the impact of the new graduation requirement on dropout and graduation rates. While we cannot track individual students, overall enrollment figures provide an indication of the extent to which students in each grade fail to proceed to the next grade with the rest of their classmates.

Table 2.13 shows the decrease in enrollment from the 9th to the 10th grade. In the text that follows, we refer to this difference as a “drop-off” in enrollment. Some of the difference may be due to students who did not finish coursework and repeat a grade rather than dropping out of school altogether. Results indicate that this drop-off rate is not significantly higher for the Classes of 2004 and 2005 than it was for prior classes. Table 2.14 shows similar information for the drop-off between 10th and 11th grade enrollments. *Results show that the drop-off rate between 10th and 11th grade enrollments was significantly less for the Class of 2004 than it was for prior classes.*

TABLE 2.13 Enrollment Declines from 9th Grade to 10th Grade

School Year	High School Class	10 th Grade Enrollment	Prior Year's 9 th Grade Enrollment	Decrease	
				Number	Percent
2002-2003	2005	471,648	499,505	27,857	5.6%
2001-2002	2004	459,588	485,910	26,322	5.4%
2000-2001	2003	455,134	482,270	27,136	5.6%
1999-2000	2002	444,064	468,162	24,098	5.2%
1998-1999	2001	433,528	458,650	25,122	5.5%
1997-1998	2000	423,865	450,820	26,955	6.0%

Source: California DataQuest System (<http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest>)

TABLE 2.14 Enrollment Declines from 10th Grade to 11th Grade

School Year	High School Class	11 th Grade Enrollment	Prior Year's 10 th Grade Enrollment	Decrease	
				Number	Percent
2002-2003	2004	428,117	459,588	31,471	6.8%
2001-2002	2003	420,295	455,134	34,839	7.7%
2000-2001	2002	409,119	444,064	34,945	7.9%
1999-2000	2001	401,246	433,528	32,282	7.4%
1998-1999	2000	390,742	423,865	33,123	7.8%
1997-1998	1999	378,819	413,725	34,906	8.4%

Source: California DataQuest System (<http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest>)

It is possible that the CAHSEE requirement, which has led to significantly increased remediation efforts for students at risk of failing, contributed to this reduction in drop-off rate, although additional data and research is required to support this contribution. What is clear is **that the CAHSEE requirement has NOT led to increased dropout rates through the 11th grade.**

We looked to see whether CAHSEE results for the Classes of 2004 and 2005 were similar to results from STAR, California's standards-based accountability assessment. STAR results provide an independent view of performance of students in different high school classes. To the extent that results are similar, STAR results may also predict relative performance on the CAHSEE for future high school classes. Table 2.15 shows results from the STAR 2003 ELA assessment for the 10th and 9th grades in comparison to results from the 2002 assessment. For the 10th grade assessment, students in the Class of 2005 were assessed in 2003 and students in the Class of 2004 were assessed in 2002. Results were very similar for these two classes. Sixty-three percent of students scored at least basic for these two classes and the average scale score increased by only 2 points.

Students in the Class of 2006 were assessed in the 2003 9th grade assessment. Results from this assessment are compared to results from the Class of 2005 assessed in the 2002 9th grade assessment. Results indicate that the Class of 2006 performed significantly better than the Class of 2005. The number of students scoring at least basic increased by 6 percentage points and the average scale score increased by more than 11 points. Taken together, results shown in Table 2.15 suggest that, while ELA performance on the CAHSEE did not increase significantly for the Class of 2005 (given limitations on available comparisons), results for the Class of 2006 should be much better.

TABLE 2.15 Results from the STAR 2003 and 2002 9th and 10th Grade ELA Assessments

STAR Results for Grade 10 ELA			
Assessment Year	2003	2002	
HS Class	Class of 2005	Class of 2004	Gain
% at least Basic	63	63	0
Mean Scale Score	324.5	322.4	2.1
STAR Results for Grade 9 ELA			
Assessment Year	2003	2002	
HS Class	Class of 2006	Class of 2005	Gain
% at least Basic	69	63	6
Mean Scale Score	332.9	321.4	11.5

STAR does not include a common assessment of mathematics skills for all students at the 9th and 10th grades. Instead, assessments are targeted to specific courses and administered to students who complete these courses. Table 2.16 shows results for the Algebra I assessment, the most common assessment for students in the 9th and 10th grades. For each grade level, performance on the Algebra I assessment decreased slightly in 2003. This is balanced against the fact that more students at each grade level were taking and being assessed in Algebra I. The percent at least basic and average scale scores are higher for students taking Algebra I at earlier grade levels. As the proportion of such students increases, overall mathematics

achievement should increase correspondingly. Current STAR results do not, however, provide a clear prediction of CAHSEE performance for future classes.

TABLE 2.16 Results from the STAR 2003 and 2002 9th and 10th Grade Algebra I Assessments

STAR Results for Algebra I			
Assessment Year	2003	2002	Gain
8th Grade	Class of 2007	Class of 2006	
Percent Tested	32	29	3
% at least Basic	67	69	-2
Mean Scale Score	336.8	337	-0.2
9th Grade	Class of 2006	Class of 2005	
Percent Tested	37	32	5
% at least Basic	51	54	-3
Mean Scale Score	306.3	308.9	-2.6
10th Grade	Class of 2005	Class of 2004	
Percent Tested	25	21	4
% at least Basic	35	40	-5
Mean Scale Score	289.5	290.8	-1.3
11th Grade	Class of 2004	Class of 2003	
Percent Tested	13	10	3
% at least Basic	30	35	-5
Mean Scale Score	284.5	286.7	-2.2

Performance of Repeat Test Takers

The Year 3 Evaluation report (Wise et al., June 2002b) included extensive analysis of score gains for students taking the CAHSEE for a second time. Data from the 2002–03 CAHSEE administrations provide an additional opportunity to examine the extent to which remediation programs and other activities have increased scores for students who have to repeat the CAHSEE.

Year-round administration makes the analyses of score gains more complicated. Students from the Class of 2004 took the CAHSEE several times, sometimes with relatively short intervening periods. We recomputed score gains from 2001 to 2002 by taking results from the students' first administration in 2001 and their first administration in 2002. In a few cases, students who tested initially in 2001 did not test again until July or even September of 2002. In the current analyses, these students were added to the sample with gains from 2001 to 2002. For gains from 2002 to 2003, we used results from the students' first administration from 2002, in most cases March or May of 2002, and their first administration in 2003, in most cases March 2003.

Table 2.17 shows average gains for each part of the CAHSEE from 2001 to 2002 and from 2002 to 2003. As with the results reported last year, scores below 300 (less than random guessing) were set to 299. (See Wise et al., June 2002b for an explanation and analysis of below-chance scores.) Score gains for ELA were lower from 2002 to 2003, 10 scale points

compared to nearly 17 scale points for the previous year. Score gains for math were about 10 points in both years. At this rate of increase, the average student starting at a score level of 300 (chance level) would take five years to reach the passing level of 350.

TABLE 2.17 Mean and Standard Deviation of Score Gains for Repeat Test-Takers in Class of 2004

Test Year	ELA			Mathematics		
	No. Tested	Avg. Gain	S.D.	No. Tested	Avg. Gain	S.D.
2001 to 2002	58,043	16.6	20.0	99,614	10.6	15.8
2002 to 2003	37,297	10.4	17.0	86,067	10.2	16.1

The fact that score gains have not increased for the Class of 2004 does not mean that the effectiveness of remediation programs has not increased. Since students who passed the exam previously are excluded from the computation of score gains, the 2002 to 2003 gains are based on a sample who had not gained enough to pass last year. These students thus were likely to have had more significant deficiencies. The fact that math gains for these students are still as high as they were for a more general population of students actually speaks to the continued effectiveness of remediation. Students in the Class of 2005 are not required to retake the CAHSEE if they did not initially pass. It will be two years before students in the Class of 2006 are retested and score gains can be computed. At that time, summer of 2005, we will be able to determine more definitively the extent to which the effectiveness of remediation programs has increased.

Summary

Results from all six administrations during the 2002–03 school year were analyzed separately for students in the high school Class of 2004, who took the CAHSEE as 11th graders, and students in the Class of 2005, who took the exam as 10th graders. For several reasons, *it is not possible to make precise comparisons of results for the Class of 2005 to current or prior results for students in the Class of 2004.* During the past year, the CAHSEE was administered to essentially all students in the Class of 2005. For the Class of 2004, some students took the CAHSEE for the first time as 9th graders and others not until the 10th grade. By the end of the 10th grade, a significant number of students in the Class of 2004 had taken the CAHSEE more than once.

Cumulative passing rates through the end of 10th grade for each section of the CAHSEE were slightly lower for the Class of 2005 although, as noted, many students in the Class of 2004 had multiple chances to pass. Results from the STAR assessments also indicate comparable performance for students in the Classes of 2004 and 2005. Special education students and English learners passed the CAHSEE at significantly lower rates than their classmates. Only 27 percent of students with disabilities passed the ELA portion and about 17 percent of these students passed the mathematics portion. In addition, Hispanic and Black students had considerably lower passing rates on both portions of the CAHSEE than did

White or Asian students. The difference in pass rates between racial/ethnic groups among special education students was pronounced.

As in earlier administrations, ELA passing rates for English learners who had been redesignated as fluent English proficient were comparable to other student groups, suggesting that the lower passing rates for English learners will be erased once they achieve English proficiency. For math, passing levels were once again closely related to level of math coursework completed.

Students in the Class of 2004 who continued to take sections of the CAHSEE showed average score gains of about 10 points in each subject area. ELA score gains from 10th to 11th grade were less than average score gains from 9th to 10th grade (about 17 points). Math score gains from 10th to 11th were the same as from 9th to 10th.

One final finding in analyzing results from the 2002–03 CAHSEE administrations was that there continue to be some issues with record-keeping and possibly with schools' understanding of CAHSEE regulations and procedures. For instance, some students in the Class of 2005 appeared to have been tested earlier than intended (before the March 2003 administration); in other cases, information on the students' grade level may have been ambiguous. Some students not classified as English learners or special education students were provided with testing accommodations designed primarily for these populations. While these issues were relatively minor in comparison to data accuracy issues in earlier years, there is still considerable room for improving the accuracy and completeness of information on students taking the CAHSEE.

